

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	- CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,833	03/22/2004	Michael B. Martin	Heavyweight-1	1502
7590 12/13/2007 Browning Bushman, P.C.			EXAMINER	
Suite 1800			NGUYEN, TUẠN N	
	5718 Westheimer Houston, TX 77057		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/805,833	MARTIN, MICHAEL B.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tuan N. Nguyen	3751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (1.136(a)). In no event, however, may a right will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON (atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0.	<u> 5 November 2007</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•	•			
closed in accordance with the practice under	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.	•			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.				
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) Objected to	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
 Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur 	•	received in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as indicated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hepple in view of Tucker et al. (hereinafter Tucker).

Hepple discloses a scrub brush, which is considered as a weighted scrub brush due to the weight of the motor (76) acting thereon. The brush comprising a brush head (62) as claimed; a plurality of bristles (92) as claimed, the plurality of bristles (92 facing the floor as shown in Fig. 5) extending downward from the downwardly facing bristle support surface (defines by 90 or 91), the plurality of bristles does somewhat supporting the brush head when the brush is in use since it contact the floor; a weight (76), which is obviously removably positioned within a weight recess as claimed (see Fig. 1) because any part that assembled can be disassembled; a handle as claimed; a liquid intake port as claimed; a conduit as claimed; a liquid valve as claimed; a trigger as claimed; a liquid distribution manifold as claimed; and a chemical dispenser as claimed (see Fig. 1). The brush would inherently include a chemical valve as claimed; a male support member as

claimed (which below the motor 76); and a cantilevered support latch as claimed. Although the liquid supply of Hepple reference is not on the handle and the bristles are not solely supporting the brush head when in use as claimed, attention is directed to the Tucker reference, which discloses an analogous device, which further includes a liquid supply (141) on the handle and a plurality of bristles (40) solely supporting the brush head when in use as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ, on the Hepple handle, a liquid supply and a plurality of bristles solely supporting the brush head when in use as, for example, taught by Tucker since applying a know technique to a know device ready for improvement to yield predictable results.

4. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel et al. (hereinafter Besel) in view of Tucker.

Besel discloses a scrub brush, which is considered as a weighted scrub brush due to the weight of the motor (18) acting thereon. The Besel includes the structure of the weighted brush as claimed, a plurality of bristles (30L facing the floor as shown in Fig. 2) extending downward from the downwardly facing bristle support surface (defines by 30P), the plurality of bristles does somewhat supporting the brush head when the brush is in use since it contact the floor; wherein the weight is motor (18) which is inherently removable and the roller is wheel (34) where a user may be pivoted to a forward, inverted position to roll the brush if the user desires to. Furthermore, the roller (wheels 34) is secured to a central body via rod (34A), the roller rotatably mounted to the brush head and having a central axis (about 34A) spaced above the plurality of

Page 4

bristles such that the brush head may be pivoted to a forward, inverted position (the position when a user press on the handle 14H of Besel, the brush head tilting upward with respect to he back wheels will obviously cause the bristles to disengaged from the floor) to roll the scrub brush on the roller while the bristles are disengaged from a floor surface. The pair of laterally opposing outer body portions (about 14F) does taper downwardly from the top toward the laterally opposing ends (14F). The end of member 18 would obviously have a male end that sit in the female support of the head. The cantilevered support latch as claimed is a well known fastening means in the fastener art to clamp one member to another.

Although the bristles of Besel device are not solely supporting the brush head when in use as claimed, attention is directed to the Tucker reference, which discloses an analogous device, which further includes a plurality of bristles (40) solely supporting the brush head when in use as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ, on the Besel device, a plurality of bristles solely supporting the brush head when in use as, for example, taught by Tucker since applying a know technique to a know device ready for improvement to yield predictable results.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-7 are free of the prior art of record.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Phillips discloses another sole bristles supporting brush.

Art Unit: 3751

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571) 272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Túan Ngưyen

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3751

TN